

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| 10/752,050 | 01/06/2004 | David S. Benco | LUTZ 2 00265 | 6126 | |
| 48116 7590 04/08/2008 FAY SHARPE/LUCENT | | | EXAMINER | | |
| 1100 SUPERI | | LAI, DANIEL | | | |
| SEVENTH FI CLEVELAND | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| | | | 2617 | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE | |
| | | | 04/08/2008 | PAPER | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | | Applicant(s) | |
|-----------------|------------|--------------|--|
| | 10/752,050 | BENCO ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | DANIEL LAI | 2617 | |

| | DANIEL LAI | 2617 | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ears on the cover sheet with the o | correspondence add | ress | | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 18 March 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. | | | | | | | |
| ☑ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abando application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.131; or (3) for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following periods: | | | | | | | |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPP 706.07 | dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE | date of the final rejection | n. | | | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The data have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checket. Any reply received by the Office may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL | tension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date | of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office | ate extension fee e action; or (2) as | | | | |
| The Notice of Appeal was filed on . A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed waten AMENDMENTS. | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of the | | | | | |
| The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) hey raise new issues that would require further or (b) hey raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE beld) (c) hey raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE beld) (c) hey raise the demed to place the application in be appeal; and/or (d) hey present additional claims without canceling a | nsideration and/or search (see NOT w); tter form for appeal by materially red | E below); ducing or simplifying the | | | | | |
| NOTE: See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.15 5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) 6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) | : lowable if submitted in a separate, t ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☑ wil | imely filed amendmer | nt canceling the | | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1407. Claim(s) rejected: 1407. AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, b. because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e) United Section 1.116(e) | d sufficient reasons why the affidavi | t or other evidence is | necessary and | | | | |
| 9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to the showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. ☐ The request for reconsideration has been considered by Sec Continuation Sheet. 12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). 13. ☐ Other: | overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appear y and was not earlier presented. So n of the status of the claims after en at does NOT place the application in | al and/or appellant fail ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1 htry is below or attach | s to provide a). ed. | | | | |
| /Lester Kincaid/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617 | | | | | | | |

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments have been fully considered, but are not persuasive. In response to the argument that the finality of the rejection is premature, Examiner rectulty disagrees because claims 1, 20 and 35 of the Amendment filed 16 November 2007 recites new limitation "rewards customer loyalty", which is different from original claims 13 and 15, which recite specifically "generates a larger discount for longer customer time periods". Please also note that since Applicant amended independent claims 1, 20 and 35 with new limitation(s), it changed the scopes of the dependent claims, even though they are not amended. Therefore, the new ground of rejections was proper because it was necessitated by Applicant's amendment and hence the finality was proper.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); In re Merck & Co., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1996).

In response to the argument that Ruckart does not disclose or suggest higher discounts for higher cost subscription plans, Examiner respectfully disagrees because Ruckart discloses "discount will be greater if more expensive products are selected".

In response to the argument that Dahm does not disclose the means for performing the method of claim 1, Examiner respectfully disagrees because Dahm disclose network entities for managing billing accounts. The citation of the six columns is necessary because they are the sections describing the entities (i.e., entities shown in Fig. 24 and 28).

In response to the argument that there is no motivation to combine CCP with Dahm, Examiner respectfully disagrees because on the first line under "Pricing", CCP discloses "Our pricing is fair and competitive", followed by 'you will be a loyal happost stormer". Therefore, pricing plays an important role for customer's loyalty. One with ordinary skills in the art would modify CCP with Dahm to implement the competitive pricing plan of CCP to the customer loyalty system disclosed by Dahm.